DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 420 914 EA 029 119

AUTHOR Pavan, Barbara Nelson
TITLE Motivating Students To View Administrative Theory as Practical.
PUB DATE 1998-04-00
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Diego, CA, April 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrators; Critical Theory; *Educational Administration; Educational Objectives; *Educational Theories; Higher Education; Leadership; *Organizational Theories

ABSTRACT

This paper demonstrates a learning activity that enables students to understand their own predominant leadership frames and to motivate them to study and use a variety of theoretical models. The text provides a history of organizational theory, making note of various theories that have thrived and then wilted over time. An assessment of students who entered the school's doctoral program over a 3-year period is also offered. Students were administered the Leadership Orientations Instrument (LOI), a test that reveals the test-taker's leadership style, and the results of that testing are detailed here. It is argued that use of the LOI provides students personal information and connects theory with practice. Instructors may then have students apply these various theoretical frames to actual administrative cases. Contains 11 references. (RJM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 420 914

MOTIVATING STUDENTS TO VIEW ADMINISTRATIVE THEORY AS PRACTICAL

Barbara Nelson Pavan

Dr. Barbara Nelson Pavan
Educational Leadership and Policy Studies
Temple University 003-00
Philadelphia, PA 19122
(215) 204-6167

Presented at the American Educational Research Association
San Diego, CA
April 13,1998

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

B. Pavan

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

EA 029 119

MOTIVATING STUDENTS TO VIEW ADMINISTRATIVE THEORY AS PRACTICAL

Dr. Barbara Nelson Pavan Temple University

Purpose and Theoretical Perspective

The introductory educational administration text by Sergiovanni and others (1992) labels the major views of administrative theory as efficiency, person, political and decision-making, and culture. Bolman and Deal (1991) ask students to deliberately look at an administrative case using different lenses or theoretical frames as this has the power to unblock students from fixating on their preferred frame of reference. They believe that more effective leaders are able to use all the frames, selecting a frame according to the specific situation. This process of using multiple theoretical frames to analyze complex teaching cases is utilized for our doctoral administrative theory course (Pavan, 1996). Bolman and Deal's frames are named structural, human resource, political, and symbolic which mirror Sergiovanni's terms. In addition to these four major views; critical theory with the aspects of class, economics, gender and power is used as a fifth frame for this course (Foster, 1986). The case teaching method builds on the diversity of experiences which students bring to the class. They become active participants in the learning of the entire class community. Reframing, rather than persevering in using one theoretical frame, enables an educational leader to better respect the views of diverse stakeholder groups affected by a specific situation.

Reliance upon the structural or bureaucratic organizational pattern has persisted in educational organizations for a very long time even as business organizations began to move to a participatory or "team" concept. Consideration of political aspects or power relationships had been thought to be unthinkable for educational leaders even with the awareness that leaders who had political skills got things done. Following the

business gurus such as Tom Peters and Terry Deal as they talked about the culture of the organization, educational leaders began to recognize this aspect of leadership. Educators have always had a strong moral commitment to their work and generally indicate some dedication to the improvement of student learning when asked why they entered education. Now a number of people from business and the armed forces entering education as a second career, cite similar reasons for the change. Critical theory asks the leader to use educational improvement as a framework for action and to also expand their frame of reference to look at the social inequalities of class, economics, gender and power. Without bashing the business world, the field of education should take leadership in such actions. However, such leadership will not take place as long as the old paradigm of structure as the most efficient way to run an organization is in place. The understanding of all five leadership frames expands the horizon of the perspective educational leader.

As early as 1984, Shakeshaft and Nowell noted that the five leadership theories most frequently described in educational administration textbooks were developed and tested using predominantly male subjects. Jacob Getzel and Egon Guba's social systems model, Abraham Maslow's theory of human motivation and self-actualization, Fred Fiedler's theory of situational leadership effectiveness, Andrew Halpin's Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire, and John Hemphill and Alvin Coons' Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire continue to be found in many such textbooks. Instruments developed for the last three listed models are still used both for research and leadership development, often in educational administration classes. Ten years later, Shakeshaft (1994) notes that the stereotype of women as nurturing managers has not been convincingly demonstrated or debunked by researchers with gender remaining only one variable among many such as socialization, organizational culture and roles that need still to be investigated.

The purpose of this paper is to demonstrate a learning activity for enabling students to better understand their own predominant leadership frames and to motivate them to study and use a variety of theoretical models. The introductory activity requires each student to respond to Bolman and Deal's Leadership Orientations Instrument (LOI) with the results returned to them the following week. Next opportunities need to be made available for students to practice using the different frames. At Temple University this is done by studying each frame individually with the organizational theorists associated with each frame and then applying frames to class teaching cases.

The Leadership Orientations Instrument

Form S-2 of the LOI is limited to one section consisting of 32 items for which the respondents use a 5-point scale rating scale to indicate how often they exhibit certain behaviors. There are eight separate dimensions of leadership, two for each frame:

1. Structural Frame
   - 1.1 Analytical -- thinks clearly and logically
     -- approaches problems with facts and attention to detail
   - 1.2 Organized -- develops clear goals and policies
     -- holds people accountable for results
2. Human Resource Frame
   - 2.1 Supportive -- concerned about the feelings of others
     -- supportive and responsive
   - 2.2 Participative -- fosters participation and involvement
     -- listens and is open to new ideas
3. Political Frame
   - 3.1 Powerful -- persuasive, high level of ability to mobilize people / resources
     -- effective at building alliances and support
   - 3.2 Adroit -- politically sensitive and skillful
     -- skillful negotiator in face of conflict and opposition
4. Symbolic Frame
   - 4.1 Inspirational -- inspires others to loyalty and enthusiasm
     -- communicates a strong sense of vision
   - 4.2 Charismatic -- imaginative, creative, emphasizes culture and values
     -- models organizational aspirations

(Bolman and Deal, 1992, p.319)

Factor analysis by Bolman and Deal (1990) indicates that "The factors are usually very clean. When items do bleed across frames, it arises from overlap of the symbolic frame with the human resource or political frames. However, the political and human resource frames show little overlaps with each other, and none of the frames overlaps with the structural frame."

Recently an expanded form of the LOI (S-3) became available which includes a second part. For each of the six items in part two, the respondent is to number the four options from 1 (least like me) to 4 (most like me). This forced choice of behaviors in the four frames does not allow an individual to rate all options the same. The options are listed so that a given frame is described with the same letter in each item. An example from Bolman and Deal (1992) follows:

The best way to describe me is:
a. Technical expert
b. Good listener
c. Skilled negotiator
d. Inspirational leader

Since the course also includes a fifth frame, critical theory; another instrument encompassing all five frames had been sought without success. However, it was relatively easy to add an additional option that represented the critical theory frame to each item. The work of Foster was the main basis for these new options along with concepts from other writings by critical theorists used in the course. For the item above the additional option is Critical inquirer and a 5-point scale is used.

Method

A Temple University doctoral cohort group starts each September and together take 9 semester hours of courses: organizational theory, action research, and job-site internship plus attend seminars. The theory course was designed to develop some "habits of mind" so that administrative actions would be based on reflection, analysis,

and conscience. The five major theoretical frameworks and their accompanying theorists (Pugh & Hickson, 1997, plus course readings) are utilized to expand the participants' modes of thinking. Since the students come from many different educational settings with vast differences in their teaching and administrative experience, the case teaching method requiring that students as a group analyze a problem within a specific context and develop an administrative action plan has been noted by these students to foster their understanding of educational issues and administrative roles (Pavan, 1996).

During the first night of the theory course, each student completes the Leadership Orientations Instrument (LOI) by Bolman & Deal (1990). (See note for contact to obtain the LOI.) The results are then returned the following week for each individual with average means from the present and past classes. Data were available from the fall of 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995 and 1997. Data were not available for 1996 as I was on study leave. Class size ranged from a low of 16 to a high of 23 with a total of 94 students already having completed the instrument. For the first time in 1997 the instrument was used both at the beginning and the end of the course to determine if students had actually begun to use more diverse administrative theories to guide their administrative practice.

Part II LOI (adapted) data were collected the first and last night of class in 1997. This was the only instrument that provided information on all five frames.

Results

Students from 1992 to 1995 fall classes given the LOI to determine their preferred leadership frame on the first night, invariably rated themselves as most likely to use the structural frame with class averages that ranged from 4.08 to 4.27 on a 5 point scale. (See Table 1.) Mean average ratings for the Human Resources frame ranged from 3.80 to 3.91 while those for the Political Frame ranged from 3.85 to 3.91. Class

averages of 3.44 to 3.59 were obtained for the Symbolic Frame.

The 1997 class was very different from any of the preceding classes. The class mean averages for each frame in descending order were: Human Resources, 4.37; Symbolic, 3.93; Political, 3.80; and Structural, 3.78. At the end of the course, the order and means remained nearly the same except Structural sank to 3.70 and Symbolic rose to 4.05. This was the only class to indicate Human Resources as their preferred frame, every other class noted the Structural frame as preferred. This recent class rated the Symbolic frame as second, every other class ranked it fourth.

From 1992 to 1997 the Temple University students' usage of the Structural frame has been on a steady decrease, usage of the Symbolic and Human Resource frames have increased with the greatest increase this year, and usage of the Political frame has remained relatively constant. Gender has made little impact on class means for each frame. This becomes evident when noting that the classes of 1993, 1994, and 1997 had 61% or higher female students and these means do not differ from those obtained when the class was 42% or less female students. Also a comparison of male and female averages for each frame and each dimension each year did not reveal gender differences.

Part II of the LOI adapted to include the Critical Theory frame was used only for the 1997 class. Scores on this instrument cannot be directly compared to Part I as respondents are limited in the number of points they may use so the means are lower. Results given in Table 2 show that in September the Human Resource frame was the first choice of nine students and the class average was 3.8; five students selected the Symbolic frame as first and the class average was 3.25; three selected the Structural frame as first and the average was 2.78; Critical Theory had a average of 2.8 and Political, 2.33, with no one selected either as first. By December six students gave highest scores to Human Resources; four, to Symbolic; three, to Critical Theory; two, to

Structural; and one, to Political. The mean for Structural moved down from 2.78 to 2.34 and the means for Critical moved up from 2.80 to 3.18 and for Political up from 2.33 to 2.44 with the means for Human Resource and Cultural remaining nearly constant.

The frames were ranked in same order for both instruments (allowing for the extra frame on the second instrument) in the December administration. A slight difference was observed in the September administration. The advantage to this second instrument is the inclusion of the Critical Theory frame.

Table 3 provides the means for the two dimensions associated with each of the four leadership frames for the five September administrations from 1992 to 1997. As would be expected the greatest differences are between the first four years and the most recent years, the same as was found for the total frame scores. For the structural dimensions, a downward trend was noted for the organized dimension with a large drop in 1997, while the analytical dimension remained somewhat constant except for a drop in 1997. Both the supportive and participative dimensions of the human resources frames had remained relatively constant except for a very large rise in 1997. Scores for the powerful dimension of the political frame rose in 1995 and 1997, while the adroit dimension scores fell in 1997. As to symbolic behavior, the 1997 class viewed itself as much more inspirational and somewhat more charismatic than the previous classes.

Discussion

Bolman & Deal (1992) gathered data in 1991 on 140 school administrators from Florida and Oregon with mean average ratings of 4.06 for Structural, 4.08 for Human Resources, and 3.92 for both the Political and the Symbolic frames. While the Temple group of 94 present and perspective administrators with data gathered between 1992 to 1997 had total mean scores of 4.07 for Structural, 3.95 for Human Resources, 3.87

for Political and 3.60 for Symbolic. Differences might be accounted for by administrative experience, year of administration, gender (57% female for Temple group, unknown for Boland and Deal group), or geographic location.

Boland and Deal did report that colleague ratings using the LOI were significantly higher for female administrators than the men on all but the human resource frame. Davis (1996) also found that female secondary principals reported higher usage of all four frames that did their male counterparts. Principals in effective urban schools (Pavan & Reid,1994) tended to be women who utilized all four frames with mean average ratings ranging from 4.08 to 4.43. However, there were no gender differences for the Temple Educational Administration cohorts on this instrument.

As has been noted by Shakeshaft and others, women who enter educational administration have been socialized to de-emphasize their "feminine" traits. Yet as one looks at the reliance on the Human Resources frame by the 1997 cohort, it may be that both men and women are now feeling comfortable enough to admit that they have a deep concern for the people in their organization. Cynics may rejoin that the Human Resource frame is just another way to manipulate people to get them to do what the leader wants done, as such a "softer" version of the Structural frame. However, the optimists should rejoice to see how the Critical Theory frame resonates for these students. After initial skepticism when introduced to the critical theory frame, many saw this viewpoint as the moral aspect of education which they sought when joining this profession.

While this paper reports on the usage of the LOI, other aspects of the Temple University Organizational Perspectives course should be kept in mind. Teaching is considered by the instructors to be faciliation, not telling, as is essential when using teaching cases where students apply the frames to the cases and decide on an administrative action plan. The written assignment for this course is to write a teaching

case, analyze that case using the five frames, and develop an administrative action plan out of that theoretical analysis (Pavan, 1996). The plan for September 1998 will probably be to use the LOI at the beginning of the class along with the 6 item part II adapted, but to repeat only the latter at the end of class. The 32 item LOI part I requires some time for the instructor to score and includes only the four original frames. Part II adapted with only 6 items can be quickly scored and has the advantage of providing feedback on all five frames.

Educational Importance.

Those of us who teach the organizational theory course to practicing and perspective educational administrators generally face strong student resistance to this course because it is not deemed practical or useful. Used at the beginning of such a course, the Leadership Orientations Instrument provides the student very personal information and connects theory with practice. The course instructor then precedes to have students apply these various theoretical frames to actual administrative cases to develop within each potential leader the capacity to use all five frames and to understand appropppiate situations for their use. This paper reports one educational leadership teaching strategy that aims to enable administrators to both understand diversity and to model less stereotypical behavior.

One student wrote is his internship journal the following semester:

> I had an interview this week for an assistant principal position and one of the questions asked was, "What is your style of leadership?" One of the things I recall from our Theoretical Perspectives course is the leadership style inventory we took. I was the only one who came up "symbolic" leader. So, whenever someone asks, "what's my style?" I explain to them the symbolic approach ... I discuss the need to communicate, have a vision, and be able to lead people towards that vision. I also mention how a sense of community is important (a la Sergiovanni) in a school.

Note: To obtain the Leadership Orientations Instrument contact L. Bolman at Block School, University of Missouri, Kansas City, MO or Emil to lbolman@cctr.umkc.edu. His phone number is 816/235-5407 and fax number is 816/235-2947.

REFERENCES

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1990, April). Images of Leadership. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1991). Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bolman, L. G., & Deal, T. E. (1992). Leading and managing: Effects of context, culture, and gender. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28(3): 314-329.

Davis, T. L. (1996). Ways women work: The theoretical leadership frames used by female and male secondary principals. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Temple University.

Foster, W. (1986). Paradigms and promises: New approaches to educational administration. Buffalo, NY: Prometheus Books.

Pavan, B. N. (1996). Writing of teaching cases by students: Integrating practice and administrative theory. Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Meeting, New York, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Services No. ED 396 391).

Pavan, B. N. & Reid, N. A. (January, 1994). Effective urban elementary schools and their women administrators. Urban Education,28(4): 425-438.

Pugh, D. S., & Hickson, D. J. (1997). Writers on organizations (5th ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Sergiovanni, T. J., Burlingame, M., Coombs, F. S., & Thurston, P. W. (1992). Educational goverance and administration (3rd ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Shakeshaft,. C. & Nowell, I. (1984). Research on theories, concepts, and models of organizational behavior: The influence of gender. Issues in Education, II (3): 186-203.

Shakeshaft, C. (January, 1994). Women in urban administration: Introduction. Urban Education,28(4): 357-360.

Table 1. Class Mean Scores on the Leadership Orientations Instrument

Year	# Students	% F	% Adm.	Structure	Human Res.	Political	Symbolic
1992*	19	42	47	4.27	3.91	3.87	3.44
1993*	19	74	32	4.14	3.80	3.91	3.58
1994*	23	61	61	4.08	3.85	3.85	3.59
1995*	16	37	50	4.08	3.83	3.91	3.48
1997*	17	71	53	3.78	4.37	3.80	3.93
12/1997	17	71	53	3.70	4.38	3.80	4.05
Mean of *	94	57	49	4.07	3.95	3.87	3.60

1=Never, 2=Occasionally, 3=Sometimes, 4=Often, 5=Always
F=Female students, Adm.= Administrative experience

Table 2. Part II of LOI Adapted for Five Frames

	Structural	Human Res.	Political	Symbolic	Critical Theory
First Choices					
9/97 # Ss	3	9	0	5	0
12/97 # Ss	2	6	1	5	3
Ranks of Means	(1=highest, 5=lowest)				
9/97 LOI Part I	4	1	3	2	N/A
9/97 LOI Part II	4	1	5	2	3
12/97 LOI Part I	4	1	3	2	N/A
12/97 LOI Part II	5	1	4	2	3
9/97 Mean	2.78	3.80	2.33	3.25	2.80
12/97 Mean	2.34	3.77	2.44	3.27	3.18

Means are group average of individual scores from items:1=Least like me, 5=Most like me

Table 3. Theoretical Frames and Dimensions :
Leadership Orientations Instrument

	1992	1993	1994	1995	1997
ANALYTIC	4.03	3.99	3.84	4.09	3.85
ORGANIZED	4.51	4.29	4.31	4.06	3.71
STRUCTURAL	4.27	4.14	4.08	4.08	3.78
SUPPORTIVE	3.82	3.73	3.79	3.73	4.44
PARTICIPATIVE	4.00	3.87	3.88	3.92	4.31
HUMAN RES.	3.91	3.80	3.85	3.83	4.37
POWERFUL	3.71	3.76	3.67	3.91	3.98
ADROIT	4.04	4.05	4.03	3.91	3.62
POLITICAL	3.87	3.91	3.85	3.91	3.80
INSPIRATIONAL	3.29	3.48	3.51	3.45	4.02
CHARISMATIC	3.59	3.67	3.66	3.50	3.79
SYMBOLIC	3.44	3.58	3.59	3.48	3.93

1=Never, 2=Occasionally, 3=Sometimes, 4=Often, 5=Always